

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 6 and 8 have been amended to overcome the objections at Section 1 of the Office Action. A terminal disclaimer is enclosed to overcome the double patenting rejections at Section 3 of the Office Action. Thus, claims 1-4 are believed to be allowable, as indicated at Section 9 of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining rejections are requested in view of the following remarks.

Turning to the § 102 rejection at Section 5 of the Office Action, Maugard does not teach or suggest a camera crane having a track section pivotably attached to a boom arm to allow pivoting movement of the track section relative to the boom arm about a first axis, and about a second axis perpendicular to the first axis, as recited in claim 5. Rather, Maugard simply discloses upper and lower socket members 35 and 36 that facilitate rotational movement of a ball 34 about a vertical axis (see p. 1, col. 2, lines 26-32; p. 2, col. 1, lines 19-25). The socket members 35, 36 are not a track section, as claimed. These elements provide pivoting movement, and not the translational or linear movement of a track section. The socket members 35, 36 in Maugard do not provide a course along which something may move, but rather simply provide an isolated socket in which a ball 34 may pivot.

The square frame shown in Fig. 1 of Maugard (made up of rods 40, 42, 45 and 55) is also not a track section that contemplates sliding in/out or front/back movement. Rather, the square frame is a positioning fixture used for balancing. Col. 3, lines 25-33. In addition, the square frame cannot provide sliding front to back camera movement. With the rods 40 and 55 of the frame aligned parallel to the beam 16, as shown in Fig. 1 of Maugard, the side tubes 42 and 45 interfere with or prevent front/back camera

movement and/or positioning (and rod 42 would also block the lens of the camera). If the square frame is turned 90 degrees, rod 55 would then be aligned laterally. In this position, front/back camera movement would also not be possible. Hence, the square frame in Maugard is not a track section. Thus, a track section is entirely absent from the Maugard reference, and claim 5 is believed to be allowable.

Turning to the § 102 rejection at Section 6 of the Office Action, DE '428 does not teach or suggest a camera crane having a front section pivotable about a first axis and a second axis relative to a first end of a boom arm, as recited in claim 7. Rather, DE '428 discloses a first support platform 27, 28 pivotable about a first joint 38, and a separate camera platform that is separately pivotable about a support shaft 29. Neither the first support platform 27, 28 nor the camera platform is pivotable about two separate axes. Furthermore, the axis of the support shaft 29 is spaced apart from, and has no relation to, a first end of the boom arm in DE '428. The claimed front section, conversely, is pivotable about both a first axis and a second axis relative to a first end of a boom arm.

Additionally, DE '428 does not disclose a counter weight platform at a second end of the boom arm, or one or more leveling rods linked to the counter weight platform and a front section of the boom arm, as recited in claim 7. Rather, DE '428 discloses a screen 57, which is not a counter weight platform, or a platform of any kind, at the rear end of its boom arm. Moreover, even if the screen 57 is improperly characterized as a counter weight platform, the leveling rod 40 in DE '428 is not linked to that element, as required by claim 7. Fig. 6 of DE 333 4428 appears to show a moving counterweight, not a counterweight platform linked to leveling rods. Thus, several claimed elements are absent from the DE '428 reference, and claim 7 is believed to be allowable.

Turning to the § 102 rejections at Section 7 of the Office Action, claim 16 has been amended to clarify that the support means is a rigid support means. Kokush does not teach or suggest a camera crane having a support member attached to front and rear sections of a boom arm, adjacent to a pivot joint where the boom arm is attached to a post assembly, as recited in claim 9. Kokush also does not teach or suggest a camera crane having rigid support means attached to front and rear sections of a crane arm, as recited in amended claim 16.

Rather, Kokush discloses a camera crane including flexible, or non-rigid, tension wires 15, 16. The tension wires 15, 16 are not attached to front and rear sections of a boom arm adjacent to a post assembly pivot joint, but rather are attached to the boom 11 at several points located distally from the bearing unit 6, or "pivot joint" (see Fig. 1). Because the wires 15, 16 are tensioned via a tensioning mechanism 9 located at the rear of the camera crane (col. 2, lines 7-8), there is no suggestion in Kokush to attach the tension wires to the boom 11 at locations adjacent to the bearing unit 6, particularly at any location rearward of the bearing unit 6. Indeed, attaching a tension wire rearward of the bearing unit 6 (i.e., to the left of the bearing unit 6 in Fig. 1) would serve no support purpose whatsoever, based on the location of the tensioning mechanism 9. Thus, it is believed that claims 9 and 16 are allowable over Kokush.

Turning to the § 102 rejections at Section 8 of the Office Action, Chapman does not teach or suggest a camera crane including a support member or support means attached to front and rear sections of a boom arm or crane arm, as recited in claims 9 and 16, respectively. The "several rods" disclosed in Fig. 1 of Chapman are leveling rods. The remaining longitudinal elements are portions of the crane arm 12 itself. There is no rod or other support member attached to the front and rear sections of the

crane arm in Chapman. The half-circular guide plate shown in Fig. 1, for example, is attached to the arm frame 24, and not the crane arm 12. Furthermore, the guide plate does not provide any structural support to the crane arm 12. Thus, claims 9 and 16 are believed to be allowable over Chapman.

Claim 14 has been amended to clarify that a longitudinal axis of the front section is vertically offset from a longitudinal axis of the rear section of the boom arm (see Fig. 34). The longitudinal axes of the front and rear sections of the camera crane disclosed in Chapman are not vertically offset from each other in any embodiment. Rather, each crane arm disclosed in Chapman includes one longitudinal axis extending from the front to the rear of the crane arm. Thus, claim 14 is believed to be separately allowable.

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the indication of allowable claims at section 9 of the Office Action. Applicant agrees that the claims as listed there are patentable. However, Applicant submits that all of the claims are allowable in their pending form. A Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

Dated: June 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 34055  
Perkins Coie LLP  
Patent - LA  
P.O. Box 1208  
Seattle, WA 98111-1208  
Phone: (310) 788-9900  
Fax: (206) 332-7198

PERKINS COIE LLP

By: Kenneth H. Ohriner  
Kenneth H. Ohriner  
Reg. No. 31,646